



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
REGION 10
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98101

LDWSF
12.3.55 v1
02/18/87

REPLY TO
ATTN OF: SO-125

2/18/87

MEMORANDUM

SUBJECT: Status Report

FROM: Monica Kirk
Assistant Regional Counsel

TO: Paul Boys
Joe Cumins *Cumins*
✓ Michael Mata *Mata*
Michael Watson

1. Meeting with Jack Fox: On March 4 from 9-10:00, Jack Fox will meet with us in the ORC Conference Room for a final technical briefing before the March 6 Pre-trial Conference with Judge Rothstein and Marine Power's attorney, Ruth Nelson. Jack understands that EPA is not prepared to make its final recommendation regarding grit removal on March 4. He does expect us to have completed our planning and undertaken enough of the project to project the date by which our recommendation will be available. Michael Mata will prepare the technical status report for the March 4 meeting.
2. I have obtained approval from the Marine Power attorney for the diving survey scheduled for February 25-27. A warrant is not necessary. Michael Mata will work out details with a Marine Power representative who will be contacting him.

To ensure our divers' safety, Michael will ask an EPA employee to assist Marine Power with the topside supervision. Should Marine Power field representatives become uncooperative or it appears that uncontrolled/uncontrollable risks are present, diving should terminate immediately. While I am not anticipating problems, I will be available at the office.

cc: Jack Fox

USEPA SF



1345223



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

REGION 10

SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98101

REPLY TO
ATTN OF: S0-125

2/18/87

MEMORANDUM

SUBJECT: Status Report

FROM: Monica Kirk *[Signature]*
Assistant Regional Counsel

TO: Paul Boys *[checkmark]* MS 329
Joe Cumins *[initials]*
Michael Mata *[initials]*
Michael Watson

1. Meeting with Jack Fox: On March 4 from 9-10:00, Jack Fox will meet with us in the ORC Conference Room for a final technical briefing before the March 6 Pre-trial Conference with Judge Rothstein and Marine Power's attorney, Ruth Nelson. Jack understands that EPA is not prepared to make its final recommendation regarding grit removal on March 4. He does expect us to have completed our planning and undertaken enough of the project to project the date by which our recommendation will be available. Michael Mata will prepare the technical status report for the March 4 meeting.
2. I have obtained approval from the Marine Power attorney for the diving survey scheduled for February 25-27. A warrant is not necessary. Michael Mata will work out details with a Marine Power representative who will be contacting him.

To ensure our divers' safety, Michael will ask an EPA employee to assist Marine Power with the topside supervision. Should Marine Power field representatives become uncooperative or it appears that uncontrolled/uncontrollable risks are present, diving should terminate immediately. While I am not anticipating problems, I will be available at the office.

cc: Jack Fox



1441 NORTH NORTHLAKE WAY

SEATTLE, WA 98103

(206) 632-1441

TELEX 32-8064

FEB 13 1987

OFFICE OF REGIONAL COUNSEL
EPA - REGION X

February 13, 1987

COPY RECEIVED

FEB 17 1987

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY
Seattle, WashingtonJackson L. Fox, Esq.
Office of U.S. Attorney
3600 SeaFirst Fifth Avenue Plaza
800 Fifth Avenue
Seattle, Washington 98104Re: U.S. and State v. Marine Power & Equipment Co.,
Inc. and WFI Industries, Inc. - Cause No. C85-382R

Dear Jack:

This letter is a follow-up to our combination get-acquainted/progress report telephone conversation on Wednesday. It was my understanding that the EPA is conducting studies to determine how much of the lake and river bottoms need to be cleaned; how much of that is the responsibility of Marine Power; and what needs to be done. You further indicated that cleaning was the chief interest of the EPA in this matter since the company is bankrupt (\$186 million in debt, not counting interest accrual) so that pursuit of a money judgment would be fruitless. Finally, you asked if I could provide you with some idea of whether or not MPE would be willing to simply dredge the drydock areas so you could bypass the need for extensive EPA studies.

I have discussed that question with our managers, who confirm my suspicion that it would be impossible to get estimates on costs without knowing what it is we are responsible for cleaning. That would tell us how deep we have to dredge, how much material will be taken up and where we can dispose of it, all critical factors for a contractor to take into account for his estimate. For example, the cost rises astronomically if the stuff has to be taken to Arlington for disposal.

To get a rough figure, I asked what the cost would be if we were told to dredge a thin crust (about 12") in a narrow area around and underneath the drydocks for disposal at 4-mile rock - the cheapest job I could imagine. I was told that the direct costs would run to \$500,000. We must also, however, consider the indirect costs. Among these are included the costs of moving each of the floating drydocks, the costs of obtaining a permit for moving the ARD and finding alternative moorage in Lake Union, the cost of lifting various pieces of the synchrolift in order to get under a particular spot (the synchrolift is not movable), and the

copy to Matilda Watson,
Boys, Cummings
on 2/18/87
MLC



Mr. Jackson L. Fox
February 13, 1987
Page Two

cost of shutting down the use of the drydocks during the time it takes to dredge.

In other words, it is clear that this is going to be an expensive operation which, for the time being, is far beyond the company's resources. Before we can find out just how far beyond, we need to know what it is you think needs to be done.

Nevertheless, I think it is still possible to settle this matter without litigation. Indeed, a trial would be a pure waste of time, energy, and money since the strictest clean-up order, coupled with a tough monetary penalty, would only be a pyrrhic victory considering what it would surely do to the company's already precarious financial position. We are already operating under a partial consent decree imposing severe conditions on our drydock management practices which, I believe, was your primary purpose for filing suit. With the proper information, we should be able to come to a similar agreement for clean-up, if that turns out to be necessary.

To that end, I am tracking down the maintenance dredging permit which we discussed (which the company obtained for the synchro-lift, but never needed to use), as well as some history of the soundings we have regularly taken at both yards for several years. When I have that information, and you have some idea of what the EPA thinks is necessary, I would be happy to meet with you at your convenience to discuss a possible settlement.

Sincerely,

WFI INDUSTRIES, INC.

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Ruth A. Nelson".

Ruth A. Nelson
Associate General Counsel

RAN:js

cc: Lee Rees, Esq. - Office of Attorney General
Richard C. Woeck